



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,031	12/22/2004	Fabiennc Cuesta	PW/3-22710/A/PCT	7044
324	7590	04/11/2006	EXAMINER	
CIBA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT 540 WHITE PLAINS RD P O BOX 2005 TARRYTOWN, NY 10591-9005			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1624		
DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/519,031	CUESTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-12, 14, 16 and 17. is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included addition of new claims 16-17 and amendment to claims 1, 4-6, 9 and 10, file on 1/9/2006, is made of record. Claims 13 and 15 were withdrawn in the previous office action.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16 and 17 are now under examination.

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 13 and 15 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper dated 1/9/2006. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Applicants' traversal to overcome the restriction requirement is not persuasive. First of all, contrary to applicants' urging ,the PCT application entering the national stage has to be examined based on the guidelines provided under unity of invention in MPEP § 1.475 which are reproduced below:

UNITY OF INVENTION

§ 1.475 Unity of invention before the International Searching Authority, the International Preliminary Examining Authority and during the national stage.

(a) An international and a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or

Art Unit: 1624

corresponding special technical features. The expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

(b) An international or a national stage application containing claims to different categories of invention will be considered to have unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories:

- (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or
- (2) A product and process of use of said product; or
- (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or
- (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or
- (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process.

(c) If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present.

(d) If multiple products, processes of manufacture or uses are claimed, the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims of the application and the first recited invention of each of the other categories related thereto will be

Art Unit: 1624

considered as the main invention in the claims, see PCT Article 17(3)(a) and § 1.476(c).

(e) The determination whether a group of inventions is so linked as to form a single general inventive concept shall be made without regard to whether the inventions are claimed in separate claims or as alternatives within a single claim.

Based on entry b) it is clear that a product and its use has unity of invention hence the special technical feature and as per entry c) If an application contains claims to more or less than one of the combinations of categories of invention set forth in paragraph (b) of this section, unity of invention might not be present.

In the instant case claims 13 and 15 relate to a paper product and textile and does not relate to method of using the whitening composition.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

In view of applicants' response, all 112 second paragraph rejections made in the previous office action have been obviated. However, the following rejections apply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohringer WO 98/42685.

Rohringer et al. discloses compound of formula I shown in page 2 useful as fluorescent whitening agents, which include generically instant compounds. See page 2, formula I and note all the variable groups overlap with instant those of triazinyl-stibene sulfonic acid core. Particularly note Rohringer et al., permits R₁ to be independent choice and can therefore be same amino acid choice or different amino acid choice. Different choice of amino acid would meet the requirement of instant R₁ and R₂. See pages 14-29 for examples 1-19. Although the examples, show same R₁ choices, Rohringer et al. teaches equivalency the exemplified compounds with those generically

Art Unit: 1624

claimed including where R₁ choices on the two triazine rings are different as noted above.

Hence, Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds variously substituted in triazine ring including those generically taught as permitted by the reference and expect resulting compounds (instant compounds) to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

In view of applicants' amendment, this rejection is deemed as obviated.

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 14 , 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohringer WO 98/42685 , Gold et al., US 3,532,692 , Hausermann et al. US 3,272, 805 and Thompson et al., WO 96/00220 for reasons of record.

Teaching of Rohringer et al as discussed in the above 103 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted , above Rohringer et al. teaches both symmetrical and unsymmetrical compounds based on same or different R₁ choices.

The remaining three references teaches compounds which meet the requirement of formula Ia and Ic

Each of these references teaches composition for optical whitening as in instant claims. Hence, it would be obvious to one trained in the art to make a composition of the individual compounds and use the composition for the same use.

This rejection is same as made in the previous office action but now includes newly added claims as well.

Applicants' argument to overcome this rejection is not persuasive. First of all contrary to applicants' urging Rohringer et al., still teaches compounds embraced in formula Ic when R₂ is amino acid. He also teaches both asymmetrical and symmetrical compounds.

Secondly, the Gold et al. include both symmetrical and asymmetrical compounds.

Hence, it would be obvious for one trained in the art to use mixture of optical whitening agents with similar and dissimilar groups.

As for table 2, it relates to water solubility not the optical brightening.

Hence, this rejection is proper and is maintained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

3/31/2006